THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI OCTOBER, 1958 No. 460

Editorial

WE remember many years ago hearing C. E. Osborne say that the expression "our incomparable liturgy" is generally used with reference to the Book of Common Prayer by people who are unacquainted with any other liturgies with which they can compare it. Since then, interest in the ways of worship in other communions has been spreading among Christians, and there has been a growing dissatisfaction with liturgical forms that have come down from the Middle Ages and the Reformation. A lively account of what has been happening on the continent, especially in France, is provided in J.-D. Benoit's *Liturgical Renewal: studies in Catholic and Protestant developments on the continent* (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.).

Although in the Church of England there has been a good deal of talk about "the liturgical movement", it must be confessed that in practice we have not yet shown much enterprise. There has been a certain amount of tinkering here and there with the communion service in the Book of Common Prayer, but no attempt to produce a new liturgy that will adequately express what we are supposed to have been learning, from the Bible and the rediscovery of the primitive church, about the theology of the eucharist and the corporate character of Christian worship. In this as in other matters an ounce of practice may be worth a ton of theory, and it is unlikely that the people of God will be able to appropriate what their masters and pastors are saying in books or from the pulpit without the provision of a much better form of eucharistic liturgy.

We therefore applaud the enterprise that has been shown in the production of *An Experimental Liturgy* by G. Cope, J. G. Davies and D. A. Tytler (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.). It is the outcome of work that has been done by a group in Birmingham over a period of years, and with the approval of the Bishop of Birmingham it has been submitted to the vital test of use. While liturgical experts and others will no doubt have improvements to suggest, it seems to us that this is the kind of thing for which we have been waiting, and we trust that its further experimental use will be facilitated. The time has come when congregations, after due preparation along the lines described by Mr Ecclestone below, should be given an opportunity not only of hearing about but of experiencing a new form of eucharistic worship. We are surprised that the authors, in the course of the valuable essays with which they introduce and explain this liturgy, lend their support to the cliché about "the present liturgical chaos in the Church of England". The use of such language betrays ignorance either of the Church of England or of the nature of chaos. What is at present to be feared is not too much variety but a dull persistence in uncriticized conventions.

This is true of mattins and evensong as well as of the communion service. Articles in this number deal with questions to which we hope the Liturgical Commission is giving full weight. If so, the Church of England may be on the threshold of a fruitful period of "innovation, invention and experiment".

Experiment in the Parish

"I NEVER saw Zeal without Innovation more exemplified than in Dr Barlow." So Hannah More wrote of her ideal country clergyman, and her careful distinction of the qualities of his work springs very properly from her conviction that this was the way to set about it. Yet she herself was responsible for much innovation and belongs to that large army whose actions are braver and wiser than their words. Innovation, invention, experiment are, in any case, part of contemporary life. The parish priest finds himself faced with the need to formulate policy to an ever-increasing extent, and so to make clear to himself and to others where and why he will try to place the emphases. What follows is simply a record of one such experiment over some sixteen years. The parish consisted of about 14,000 people in an industrial city. The average communicant attendance per Sunday was twenty-two and there was no large number of people with churchgoing habits. Indifference, rather than hostility, to the Church would sum up the attitude of most parishioners. One of the consequences of such a situation, where a small group doggedly holds on, is a tendency to shun sustained inquiry about what is going on. It seems disloyal or disheartening to indulge in such a thing, just as it would seem unnecessary where great popularity reigned. The experiment nevertheless began just here.

What appeared to be necessary at the outset was some way of bringing to the level of conscious purpose membership of the Church and participation in its services; to make explicit what is largely assumed in the Book of Common Prayer. If innovation was called for, it was a matter of digging down to foundations first of all, to lay bare what otherwise might be taken for granted and in practice be quite ignored. That meant assembling the congregation week by week in the Parish Meeting, primarily in order that those who took the trouble to come should be able to question and discuss the situation. But it had to be more than giving the opportunity. It had both to commend itself as a matter of obligation and to provide over the years a persistent stimulation to people to be inquiring and critical, by no means an easy task for those predisposed to simply holding on. It had, moreover, to learn to insist upon deeds issuing out of discussion in some things and equally strongly to realize that a process of clarification of minds must go on over years without being cut short in too easy decisions.

There grew out of this a more detailed perception of what was required. The task was:

(*a*) To enable the congregation to know itself as a community; its

members becoming more deeply aware of common purpose and things shared in.

(*b*) To enable this growing community to express itself more deliberately in forms of worship, in thought and action.

(*c*) To enable this community to see its work more clearly, to play a more significant part in the life of the locality, to enable its members to participate in social and political purposes.

The first part of this task has its parallel in secular society and is plagued with characteristic difficulties. How can it be possible in the dispersing conditions of modern life to enable people to build satisfactory social units? Prof. MacMurray has made it abundantly clear that this is profoundly a religious problem. Our beginning lay in an examination both of the Church and of its foundation by God in man. Our church dedication—the Holy Trinity—was clearly a basis on which to work. What Prof. Leonard Hodgson has called learning to live in Trinitarian fashion was exactly the job we were faced with. We had therefore to make it abundantly clear that we believed in equality of persons and such degrees of "I in thou" as permitted and enabled fellow-Christians to know each other more intimately and to respect each other more deeply. This is a slow process in which people learn to drop defences and be themselves, but the reality of it has been witnessed to again and again by such remarks as that made by one person who did not ever cross the doorstep of the church building, "I come here because I meet people who care for me as a person", and again by another, "I realize that I am loved here".

It is easy to dismiss such things as "just talk", but in truth they point to a fundamental task: that of promoting and deepening understanding between persons on the basis of a decision "to stay together", and achieving communication which involves as much listening as talking. The process is comparable to that experienced in married life over years of shared experience and involving all aspects of human life. The Parish Meeting was therefore bound to concern itself not simply with ecclesiastical affairs, but with personal relationships, work, politics, the arts, scientific matters, and persistently to endeavour to secure a widening of outlook that might make it possible to make clear the Christian concern for total life.

The translation of this into matters related to church services is equally a long-term policy. The basic intention was that this body in process of becoming aware of its calling should assemble just as deliberately each week for the Parish Communion, clearing the decks to the extent of making it known that people were not being asked to attend any other services, apart from those of Holy Week. What was necessary was a decisive break with the fashion of equating worship and church services. The functional job of the Parish Communion was "to give the note" again to people whose whole week was their act of worship, in the performance of which they inevitably got flat or completely broke down. It was to make clear that while everything was being done to insist on the total immersion of the Christian in daily life in "the destructive element", with equal deliberation we affirmed together in this Holy Communion "the victory

that overcometh the world". Hence some changes in emphasis in what was done in church: the offertory procession in which all would participate representatively, the reading of the Epistle by laymen, the biddings to prayer prior to the Prayer for the Church and the prayer itself said by a layman, the corporate recital of the Prayer of Humble Access and the Thanksgiving after Communion, the careful attention to "Amens", the occasional use of versicles and responses at particular seasons, and the Easter salutation of the Risen Christ, the use of bread baked by a member of the congregation, all help to make more deliberate the sense of a body engaged. At the same time the utmost use of pictures, posters, models—visual aids—to bring home to those in the church building the "concerns" of the Church at the time. One example may be given: the Charter of the African National Congress, extracts from letters from African native leaders, from Fr Huddleston's writings, pictures of the accused in the Treason Trials, statements of the bishops of the South African Province, all appear on the walls of the church.

This concern for local and world-wide matters has then to be translated into action. It has meant, for example, that the Parish Meeting took the preliminary steps to bring into existence the local Community Association and provided the first officers to secure its development, thereafter being content to play a serviceable part among those gradually being encouraged to join in. It has encouraged others to devote some time to social work with old people in the clubs and to visit others in order to wheel them out. In the wider field it has meant participation in public meetings, demonstrations, deputations and processions on questions of nuclear warfare, colonies and world peace. These things are much more difficult to sustain than many people believe, since participation in week-in week-out social and political activity is at a low ebb in England as a whole. What matters intensely is that Christian people should take their part, prepared and informed, and willing to learn. The tragic fact is that in meeting after meeting the lack of widespread Christian concern and purpose is painfully obvious. Even upon such matters as clean air the majority of people in churches have not yet recognized their opportunity or responsibility. As a consequence, it is part of the continued work of the Church to train its members to be ready to send delegates wherever the occasion is offered.

Quite clearly this means embarking on controversial matters and presents the Church with problems of unity and cohesion. Maturity will be bought only by years of patient endeavour to hold together in love and charity those whose differences of outlook are made more evident by this way of approaching our job. Understanding rather than agreement will be the most that can be hoped for in many concerns. This in its turn depends upon a growing appreciation of the extent to which our choice of life in the Church has involved us with other people. To have made it a rule that each year a new churchwarden, by turns a man and a woman, should be elected has meant that such participation is open to all. That people are trusted to give up to the hilt and never asked to contribute more or work to

raise money by other means, does help not only to settle the questions of church finance but also to train church people in a sense of genuine responsibility.

What emerges slowly is something recognizably like a disciplined fellowship, aware of its own experience and much more capable of understanding what the Bible and the Prayer Book have to say about and to the Church. It is a body freed from indifference to or resentment against the secular world. It is a community in which the person finds fulfilment, and the newcomer an evangel. It is a church engaged in "growing up into him in all things".

ALAN ECCLESTONE.

Unchristian Liturgy

ONE of the functions of the Church's liturgy is to evoke in the worshipper an attitude towards God considered appropriate. The most obvious example is the *Sanctus*, which evokes adoration of God's ineffable richness and mystery. Or we could take the eucharistic words of institution, which evoke loving gratitude for what God in Christ did for us upon the cross. Those therefore who compose or revise a liturgy must always be concerned with the attitude towards God likely to be evoked by any particular form of words, and must ask whether such an attitude is compatible with our understanding of the Christian gospel.

It will be the contention of this article that certain passages in the Book of Common Prayer are likely to evoke an attitude towards God which is profoundly unchristian.

The gospel can never be defined. But two well-known passages of the New Testament may be taken as summarizing what God has done for us in Christ: Gal. 4. 6 f.—"And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father, so that thou art no longer a slave but a son"; 1 John 4. 16 ff.—"And we know and have believed the love which God hath in our case. . . . Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment. . . . There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth is not made perfect in love."

When the people of God meet together for worship, the liturgy they use should help to evoke an attitude of fearless joyful confidence in him. It should seek to create an atmosphere of trustful love in which men can grow freely into spiritual maturity. For it is only in so far as we thus realize that we are in Christ that we can begin to approach the measure of the stature of his fulness. The same principle can be observed on the purely human level. It is the atmosphere of trustful love in a home which enables the children to accept themselves, to apprehend their value as unique persons, and so to mature into people who feel secure enough to give themselves away without anxiety. All human happiness, endeavour, and achievement depend upon this ability to give without the crippling fear of loss. And it is

not for nothing that the family is the analogy the New Testament uses to describe our Christian relationship with God. He is our Father who accepts and loves us, recognizing our enormous potentialities for good ("to be conformed to the image of his Son"), standing by us and taking our part in a hostile world. We are his sons who can come to him without being nervous or self-conscious or more obviously afraid. And this deep certainty slowly enables us to give—in the end to the uttermost, or, in St Paul's words, to die with Christ. And this dying is our fulfilment, because it is thus that we share Christ's resurrection.

The liturgy of the Church should try to express the boldness we have in Christ, and so help us to realize it. It should charge the air with the sense that we are at home, that God is for us and believes in us infinitely more than we believe in ourselves. It should help us to apprehend with our total being that we are of infinite value, so that we no longer have to put on a façade, pretending to be different from what we really are, uncomfortably disguising one half of ourselves from the other half. For these are merely ways of defending ourselves from what we conceive to be a hostile and malevolent externality. And God is always on our side. A liturgy should help us to know and feel this as we worship.

Morning and Evening Prayer begin with something calculated to have an exactly opposite effect—the General Confession. It is not denied in the slightest that in a great variety of ways we often fail to give God the love we know he deserves. And in the security of his love we no longer have to pretend that we don't. The realization that he is on our side makes it possible for us to be honest about ourselves. We can confess our sins simply and humbly. But the General Confession is not simple. It is an elaborate piece of attitudinizing, full of the self-consciousness which excludes humility. It sounds like a desperate attempt to persuade God to forgive us. And the technique of persuasion it employs is one which is well known in the psychiatrist's consulting room. A small child feels that its survival depends upon the maintenance at all costs of its relationship with its parent. In a "bad" home, where the parents are possessive or domineering, the child feels that the maintenance of the relationship can by no means be taken for granted but depends entirely upon himself. He must pay for it, and the price is the attempted extinction of his own individuality. Father (or mother) doesn't love me for my own sake but merely as an extension of himself. So father disapproves of me as me, and thus I also disapprove of me as me. But if I try not to be me and admit that being me is a monstrous outrage, then perhaps father will maintain me in relationship, and this is my one chance of survival. Put in other language—father will keep me only if I sell myself to him as his slave. If I grovel and deny all value to myself as me, if I can get myself to exist only as his boy, then I can persuade him to approve of me, and without his approval I cannot live. This sort of experience in early childhood has results which continue when I am grown up. It produces pathological guilt, i.e. guilt not about any identifiable wrong I have done but about being a person

at all. Such guilt is always destructive in its effects. It can never lead to any good of any kind.

It is hard not to believe that we have a re-enactment of this process in Cranmer's General Confession. Notice the emphatic reiteration—"We have left undone those things which we ought to have done: And we have done those things which we ought not to have done; And there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou them, O Lord, who confess their faults. Restore thou them that are penitent." What "good" human father would not feel that he had failed totally if his erring son came back to him, not with the sorrow born of love, but with this attitude of fear which seeks to manipulate and appease what would otherwise be destructive hostility? The God here conjured up is the father of Samuel Butler's *Way of All Flesh*. And immediately he creates an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear, calculated to arouse every shred of latent pathological guilt. He can be cajoled into receiving his children provided that they grovel like slaves. Let them therefore admit (every Sunday, every weekday) that there is nothing good about them. Deep down, below the level of consciousness, this grovelling is creating hatred. For we cannot help hating those who deny us the right to be ourselves. Hatred is one of the many fruits of pathological guilt. We can damp it down as sinful. But it will find expression somehow. Sooner or later, somebody is bound to provide us with a rational excuse for hating them.

This atmosphere of uncertainty and fear, productive of pathological guilt, is likely to be created also by certain sections of the Holy Communion service. Instead of being allowed to confess our sin and then to worship in the full assurance of faith, we are constantly being dragged back to contemplate our misery as though God had not really forgiven us at all.

In the General Confession there is the same technique of persuasion as in Morning and Evening Prayer. ["Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father" sounds like an attempt to remind God that he is merciful in the hope that, thus reminded, he may be so.] The air is already heavy with anxiety. Then come the Absolution and Comfortable Words. On the conscious level, these of course are meant to reassure. But one can detect in them the uncertainty of over-emphasis. Imagine a child saying: "Father loves us because he says so, Father loves us because he suffered to make us happy. Yes, father *is* loving. Didn't you hear Uncle George saying so yesterday afternoon? And not only Uncle George, but Auntie Nellie said the same thing when she was here last week." In such circumstances a visitor to the household would tend to get a little suspicious of father's love. No child in a happy family would go on saying this sort of thing. His father's love would be as natural and inevitable to him as the air he breathed. And this is precisely the atmosphere generated by the *Sanctus*. It speaks of serene faith, love, hope, peace, home in the heart of God. But we are not allowed to remain in this splendour of love. The time has come round again for one more self-conscious grovel. Unless we tell God we are not worthy so much as

to gather up the crumbs under his table, he may lock the dining-room door in our face!

It is abundantly clear that, whatever his theological opinions, Cranmer never fully believed in God's forgiving love. He is too self-conscious in God's presence, too concerned to use the right approach and constantly to point out that he is doing so, too anxious that God may be offended at the last moment. We are very far indeed here from the glorious liberty of the children of God. And the black cloud of his unbelief still darkens the liturgy of the Church, often evoking in the worshipper the opposite of Christian faith.

Of course not all people will be affected in the same way. Those who have in any case a deep inward certainty of God's love can use such forms of worship without trouble. They are generally the sort of people who find it easy to worship anywhere. They can use any outward circumstance, including almost any form of words, to express the joy of their sonship. They are the few. There are others for whom church-going is a habit. So long as they have had time to grow accustomed to it, nothing that goes on in church disturbs them. They resent only innovations. Considerably more people slowly drink in the atmosphere engendered by the liturgy. For them Christianity comes to mean the attempt to anaesthetize three-quarters of themselves. The slavish attitude to God is a positive pleasure. They are spiritual masochists. Pathological attitudes generated in early childhood are now reinforced by the absolute sanction of religion. Inevitably they tend to be rather ineffective personalities—either passive or prickly. But the vast majority of people are just put off. They seldom realize why. All they say is that what happens in church has no relevance to their lives. What they often mean is that they are healthy people who refuse to cope with life by the technique of cringing. Good parents and useful citizens, they have the honesty to feel that there are integral parts of the church's services in which they cannot join without hypocrisy. They find more abundant life outside the church than in. There is a sense in which their faith is too robust for some of the attitudes demanded of them in church.

There remains one point of supreme importance. It is a theological commonplace that we can think and speak of God only in terms of analogy. What is less seldom understood is the fact that these analogies are highly charged by our earthly experience. It is true that in thought we can make allowances for the imperfections and perversions of the human image. Unless I am a lunatic I do not *think* that God is like a Mr Pontifex. The trouble is, however, that these analogies or images evoke us at levels of our being far deeper than our capacity for intellectual discrimination. And here to speak of God as Father may well conjure up a Mr Pontifex. So it was, I believe, to some extent with Cranmer. He was willing for the truth's sake to be burnt to death. This article is not an attempt to denigrate one of God's heroes, but to suggest that in certain parts of the liturgy he wrote we are presented with a God who is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ because he inspires fear more than faith.

H. A. Williams.

Understandest thou what thou Singest?

Imagine yourself in church with someone tender in the faith. He is a questing, eager person whom you have persuaded with some difficulty to return to public worship after a long lapse. The church is, on the whole, a live one: there is an atmosphere of worship; the service is conducted with reality and intelligence; the hymns are well chosen; the sermon is likely to be a good one. But the Psalms! You look sideways at your young inquirer, in an agony of apprehension, while you sing that Moab is your washpot, or invoke the mighty to bring young rams unto the Lord (a quaint combination into a single, meaningless sentence of two alternative spellings of a single Hebrew word). Here is a person whom you have been doing your best to instruct in a reformed, intelligent Christian faith, and he is called upon to sing from a Psalter which is full of archaic, unintelligible, irrelevant phrases and questionable translations: "From the men of thy hand, O Lord, from the men, I say, and from the evil world", "One deep calleth another, because of the noise of the water-pipes", "The princes of the people are joined unto the people of the God of Abraham", "Like as we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of hosts", "The river of God is full of water: thou preparest their corn, for so thou providest for the earth", "Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove: that is covered with silver wings, and her feathers like gold" . . . and so on. A commentary can explain, sometimes what such words mean, sometimes that they are mistaken, sometimes that any meaning there might once have been is lost; but as they stand, it would take a very remarkable worshipper to attach any clear-cut meaning to them. You blush that sincere seekers should be treated to such mumbo-jumbo.

But it would be a great mistake to imagine that the most serious charge that can be levelled against the use of the Psalter in Anglican worship is that it is sung in an archaic, inaccurate and often unintelligible version. Even unintelligibility is better than those all too easily intelligible sentiments, with which it is strewn, which are in flagrant conflict with the Christian spirit. Of course we know that there are brackets in the 1928 Book. But what is the use of brackets which, for reasons which are critically sound but liturgically unimportant, painstakingly exclude part of the harmless and truthful description of the wicked in Ps. 14—which contains no word of imprecation—but allow us still to sing a hymn of bloody hate which might well have come from the war-songs of Qumran—"Let the praises of God be in their mouth: and a two-edged sword in their hands"—and many a worse sentiment of nationalism and self-satisfaction.

The use of the Psalter in Christian worship is the most conspicuous pocket of sub-Christian thought unreformed obscurantism still remaining in the Anglican Prayer Book. Of course we know the replies that are made to such charges. First, that from the very earliest times the Psalms have been allegorized, so as to apply to Christ and his Church. Indeed there is a regular Canon of Interpretation, regarded

almost as fundamentalistically by its devotees as are the literal words of Scripture by fundamentalism. But when serious and mentally alert Christians have long ago left behind the word-jugglery of the pre-critical ages, why should this one territory continue to be defended against reason? If we wish to sing about Christ and his Church (and we do), why not choose words intended for the purpose, instead of words alien to it which have to be tortured into carrying the requisite senses? The answer (and this is the second line of defence) is that the Psalter, first in Latin (mainly the Gallican) and then in Coverdale, has been so built into Christian life and thought, has become so much a part of the very texture of Christian piety, that it is too precious a medium of devotion to be jettisoned. Prothero is only one of the great cloud of witnesses to the way in which the Psalter has alway risen spontaneously to the lips of those who have been in need of words to give them utterance. Besides—and we merge here insensibly into a third line of defence—the language of Coverdale is hauntingly lovely, and the Psalter contains some of the most magically evocative phrases, I suppose, in all literature. "Now for the comfortless troubles' sake of the needy . . . I will sing of the Lord, because he hath dealt so lovingly with me ["so lovingly" is not in the original at all!] . . . Why art thou so full of heaviness, O my soul: and why art thou so disquieted within me? Put thy trust in God . . .": the treasury of devotion would be robbed of pearls of great price if such words and phrases were flung away. Many would agree that to listen to the Psalms in King's College Chapel is an experience of sheer beauty never to be forgotten. That combination of sensitively rendered music with the elusive beauty of words charged with sweet associations is quite irresistible.

All this must be freely acknowledged. And I suppose that the most honest defence of the Psalter would be to regard it as a sort of music or as analogous to much modern poetry. Although sometimes meaningless to the intellect or logically inappropriate, its words evoke emotion by their direct address to that in us which is beyond reason: they help to create an atmosphere. The sub- or supra-rational quality of the experience, indeed, is attested by the famous observation of A. E. Housman in his Leslie Stephen Lecture for 1933: ". . . as for the seventh verse of the forty-ninth Psalm in the Book of Common Prayer, 'But no man may deliver his brother, nor make agreement unto God for him', that is to me poetry so moving than I can hardly keep my voice steady in reading it. And that this is the effect of language I can ascertain by experiment: the same thought in the bible version, 'None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him', I can read without emotion."

But when such emotion is stirred, is it a Christian emotion? Hardly in Housman's case. And is it good enough for reformed worship, aiming to sing with the understanding as well as with the spirit, to tolerate, merely for their stirring and vaguely evocative quality, words which, rationally speaking, mean nothing or may (as we have seen) mean all the wrong things? To that question, as I see it, there can be only one answer. And that answer carries with it the corollary that

it would not be enough (even if it were possible) merely to produce a new and better translation of the Psalter and to sing that as we now sing Coverdale. For one thing, modern biblical scholarship is acutely conscious of the amount of the Psalter that is lost beyond recovery: of a considerable amount it is impossible for us to know the meaning. Further, a really first-rate modern version even of what can be confidently understood may well be too prosaic to sing. Much of the Psalter is, in the original, mediocre verse and will not go into anything very poetical in a faithful translation. (It is to be remembered, incidentally, that the New Translation now being prepared is not *primarily* intended for use at worship.) But—most important of all—we come round again to my main point, that a large part of the Psalter is simply sub-Christian and unsuitable, and the more accurately it is translated, the clearer this will become. In a recent discourse on the Psalter it was remarked that the new translation, happily, would eliminate archaic phrases such as "a high stomach". "But", observed a listener, "I don't want to sing about a high stomach even in modern idiom." It may be perfectly right to *read* sub-Christian lections for a Christian congregation to hear and learn from: duly explained and put in its setting in the long story of the education of the People of God, Judges 5 has its place as an Old Testament lesson. And I, for my part, shall continue to read the Psalter in its entirety, in Hebrew, as part of my private Bible reading. But Judges 5 is not a suitable medium for Christian worship, for Christians to take upon their lips *as an act of praise to God*;[1] and neither are many of the songs which, unlike Judges 5, did get into the Hebrew liturgical hymn book. Incidentally, that latter phrase is somewhat misleading. Was the Psalter, in its entirety, ever really the Hebrews' hymn book? Defenders of the use of the Psalter in Christian worship sometimes aver that Jesus himself must have used the whole of it. But I have failed to find conclusive evidence of this; and I understand that modern Jewish congregations, at any rate, are more conscious than many Christians of the need for selectiveness.[2]

In a word, the time is long overdue for a radical purge. What is needed is not merely better translation, but selection. There are some Psalms which are precious beyond compare, and which no Christian would dream of giving up as a medium of worship. Of such there is no need to say more. They are far beyond praise. But if these, and certain others which, though less good, are tolerable in Christian

[1] "It is one thing to listen to the reading of Old Testament lessons as inspired records of pre-Christian history, and quite another to recite and sing Old Testament songs instinct wih pre-Christian hopes and aspirations as a mode of expressing Christian faith and worship."—Oscar Hardman in THEOLOGY, 51 (1948), p. 47.

[2] See I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (C.U.P.), Series I, p. 157: "The Synagogue has no need to eliminate Psalms lix and cix (the chief of the imprecating Psalms) because they are not used in regular Jewish public worship!" Those words were published in 1917: the 1928 Prayer Book does not bracket either of the Psalms mentioned. The whole passage from which the words are quoted is illuminating as to the harm done by non-Christian attitudes within Christian compilations.

worship, are added together, the total is probably not more than some seventy. *The Broadcast Psalter* (S.P.C.K., 1948) was a big step in the right direction. Let these be kept for Christian worship, and the rest (with the most terrible excepted) used in the Lectionary; and let all (including the most terrible) be used by the conscientious Christian in his own private reading of the whole Bible, as he muses on the ups and downs of the People of God and the long way by which God has led and is leading them, and as he studies the *evidential* use of the Psalms in the New Testament.

It is a curious fact that, of all learned and reputable Anglo-Catholic liturgiologists, it was W. H. Frere himself who attempted to introduce some measure of Psalter reform in the Lower House of York Convocation in 1917. But even he did not make much headway against the entrenched conservatism. As long afterwards as 1948, Dr Oscar Hardman[1] and Mr Eric Heaton[2] were still pleading in this journal for a hearing for the case. And still we are invited to sing—to go no further than the first two months of the Church's year, following the 1928 selection—such Psalms as 2, 9, 18, 68, 94, and 110!

Perhaps the only hopeful new factor in the situation is the existence now of a Liturgical Commission. It is greatly to be hoped that they will not ignore the urgent demand for such a Psalter as shall make Matins and Evensong something better than the exclusive preserve of those who have learnt to understand archaic language and then to ignore its real meaning.

C. F. D. Moule.

The Lexicography of the New Testament

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Translated by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. 1957. C.U.P. £5 5s.

W. Bauer. *Griechish-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. 5te Auflage. 1958. Töpelmann. DM. 73.

Bauer's *Wörterbuch* has long been established internationally as the dictionary to the Greek New Testament. The first edition by Preuschen appeared in 1910. After Preuschen's death Bauer produced a much improved second edition in 1928. A third edition came out very properly under Bauer's sole name in 1937, again thoroughly revised, and a fourth edition in 1952. Each edition, surprisingly enough, was a real advance on its predecessor, and the fourth edition seemed to provide all that a scholar could ask of it. In 1957 appeared the English translation of the fourth edition and in 1958 the fifth edition. This notice is devoted to these two works.

The English version of Bauer came about through the generosity of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod which in 1947, its centennial, set aside a part of the thank-offering "as a fund for scholarly

[1] "The Prospects and Principles of Prayer Book Revision—II", Theology, 51 (1948), especially pp. 47 f.

[2] "The Use of the Psalter", Theology, 51 (1948), pp. 459 ff.

research". Profs Arndt and Gingrich were commissioned by this fund to translate and revise Bauer's *Wörterbuch*. While the revision has not changed the character of the book, it has been systematic. On p. vi is a list of words whose treatment has been significantly developed. A few new words have been added. References to standard works in English, like Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary*, have been included, and "the references to scholarly periodical literature have been brought up to the latter part of 1954". A translation of W. Bauer, *Zur Einführung in das Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, has been added. This derives from the introduction to Bauer (2). To save space it was not reprinted in Bauer (3) (1937) but, in answer to requests, it was produced separately in a revised form in 1955 as above. Profs Arndt and Gingrich have had the help of a number of scholars in their undertaking.

The addition of more words is in principle all to the good. *ξαίνειν* at Matt. 6. 28 is amply justified and now appears in Bauer (5). *εὐπερίστατος*, despite the statement on p. vi, is in Bauer (4). The editors meant *εὐπερίσπαστος*, which is not, but which is mentioned in Bauer (5) under *ἐυπερίστατος*. We may question whether *εὐσχημονεῖν* is worth a mention. It is doubtful whether it has any claims to be the original text at 1 Cor. 13. 5.

The addition of references to literature in English is real gain. German works often show a serious deficiency in such references. On the other hand, this can be carried too far. The interpretations of the A.V. have been quoted more often than they deserve, e.g. under *ὀρθοποδέω*. Again, under *φρόνιμος* the reference to *J.T.S.*, xlviii, 63 f. is unnecessary. The suggestions made there lack real evidence in their favour and are open to objection.

The work is handsomely produced. It is a pleasure to handle and to read. The Cambridge University Press has done its part well. Likewise we must praise the concern of the Missouri Synod for biblical studies. Their action is an example to us all at a time when most Christian denominations are content to pay only lip service to Christian scholarship where it is not openly derided.

Report has it that the English Bauer is to be kept up to date by revisions from time to time. This is right. Many English tools of scholarship have dropped out of use because they have not been revised and have at length become unusable. German publications, on the other hand, have gone from edition to edition and deservedly won a hold on the international market.

If a new edition is contemplated there is one act of justice that might be performed. Despite the important contribution of the translators and revisers the work is still Bauer, and yet his name does not appear on the back of the volume at all. It appears in a surprisingly insignificant position both on the dust cover and on the title page. Perhaps in the next edition it might be given the prominence due to it.

Bauer (5) is an advance on Bauer (4) (1952). It has grown from 1634 to 1780 columns, but this is partly because it is printed more spaciously. The opportunity has been taken to add references to

recent literature and to make other additions and corrections. In all, Bauer (5) is an improvement on Bauer (4). The publishers have produced a very pleasing volume.

In the abbreviations, references to Perry, *Aesopica* I, Snell, *Bacchylides*, Schwartz, *Cyrill von Scythopolis*, Latte, *Hesychius*, Mutschmann, *Sextus Empiricus* III, and others have been included. The G life of Aesop in *Aesopica* I is of particular importance to the philologist. It is not easy to find texts that have been overlooked. By contrast there seem to be no additions to the list of publications of inscriptions and papyri and very few to section 5, periodicals, standard works and the like.

The revision seems to have proceeded in considerable independence of the English Bauer. Probably Bauer (5) shows a more judicious treatment of new words. On the other hand, some references should have been taken over; for example, that to H. Chadwick, *J.T.S.*, n.s. i (1950), 156 ff., under σαίνειν. Indeed, both the Bauer (5) and the English Bauer would have done well to quote the Origen passage to which Chadwick draws our attention.

Austerity has gone far in one or two other instances. Thus, after the fascicule of Bauer (4) containing the article on ἐπιούσιος had gone to the press there appeared an article in *Museum Helveticum*, VI, 216 f., suggesting that the word should be read in an inscription of Lindos. This was inserted in Bauer (4) under σήμερον and the place of insertion explained in the introduction, p. viii. The English Bauer still kept this entry under σήμερον, though the reason for the misplacement no longer held good for the translator, and added a reference, *Museum Helveticum*, IX, 60–62, where it is shown that the restoration ἐπιούσιος rested on a misreading of the inscription. Bauer (5) excludes all reference to this episode. It would have been useful if the reference to *Museum Helveticum* IX had been retained.

One of the basic texts, the Greek Testament, is cited in Nestle's twenty-first edition (1952). The current edition of Nestle is the twenty-third (1957). It contains no significant changes in the text, but includes evidence for John 1–14 from the Bodmer papyrus, *P* (66), which reads at John 13. 5 ποδονιπτῆρα, as Bauer (5) notices. The whole of the Bodmer papyrus for John is now published, and it might be possible in a later edition to refer to the current Greek Testament and perhaps to include one or two more references to *P* (66) where it is relevant.

Now for some comments on Bauer as a whole. They are written in full consciousness of the merits of this great dictionary and do no more than suggest a few adjustments here and there. Such marginalia may show that Bauer is not only a tool but a stimulus to inquiry.

Bauer's practice as a whole is very commendable in textual as in other respects. Where early manuscripts have important linguistic evidence, Bauer has always been ready to cite them; for example, the Chester Beatty papyrus and the Michigan Hermas. If reports are true, other early New Testament papyri have been found whose evidence should be available for the next edition of Bauer.

Commendable, too, is Bauer's practice of warning us of the pres-

ence of relevant textual variants by the use of symbols such as t.r. (=textus receptus) and v.l. (=varia lectio). Sometimes we are given further warnings about the text. Thus, we are told about *ὡσεί* "in den Hss. oft m. *ὡς* wechselnd". We learn that *εὐλαβηθείς* is a variant at Acts 23. 10, and receive hints of the textus variation between *καθά, καθάπερ, καθώς, καθώσπερ* under these words. On the instances of *τε* in John Blass-Debrunner's remark "überall anfechtbar" is rightly quoted.

Just now and then we miss a reminder that would be of particular value. Thus, *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* occurs in Matthew only at 11. 5, but is here omitted by some witnesses. Again, *νομικός* is found in Matthew only at 22. 35, where some witnesses omit it. Mark has *ὁ αὐτός* (=idem) only at 14. 39. Here the whole phrase is absent from some manuscripts. In our printed texts *φάναι* occurs six times in Mark. At each place there is a variant which gives a different verb. Some witnesses omit *καὶ διεστραμμένη* at Luke 9. 41. *φέρειν* occurs in the Pauline Epistles only at Rom. 9. 22 (Bauer, 1690) and is there omitted by some manuscripts.

The limits of the texts for which Bauer is a lexicon have been clear until now. They embrace the New Testament, the Apostolic Fathers including the fragments in Funk-Bihlmeyer, fragments of various early apocryphal Gospels, detached sayings of Jesus and one or two other fragments; in fact, most Christian material from before A.D. 140 and very little from after that date. A Coptic version of the Gospel of Thomas has now come to light, and it is seen that P. Ox. 654 is part of this Gospel. It is doubtful whether the Gospel is earlier than A.D. 150. Of about the same date is the Gospel of Mary, of which we have a Greek fragment (P. Ryl. 463) as well as a Coptic version. Is this to be included? If it is, are we still to exclude the Acts of John of the same period? Probably an austere decision would be best. Gnostic texts of the mid-second century and later should be omitted.

The extent to which the papyri have been used to illustrate words is impressive. Papyrus publications, however, are very difficult to keep up to date with. Thus, Bauer does not mention in list 3 of the introduction, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* xviii–xxiv, *PSI,* xii–xiv, *Rylands Papyri,* iv, *Hibeh Papyri,* ii, *Tebtunis Papyri,* iii, 2. These volumes do not offer as rich a harvest as Bauer's examination of the earlier publications, but could be profitably quoted here and there. For example, under *ξαίνειν* we might have a reference to *Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* xix, p. 60.

Among literary texts we may call attention to the last edition of the Teubner Menander, i, 1957, ii, 1953, the second volume of which contains a useful index uerborum, as does the second volume (1957) of the Teubner Aesop. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs,* has some useful material. Instead of Hercher's editions of the Greek novelists, Vilborg's *Achilles Tatius,* W. E. Blake's *Charito* and Dalmeyda's *Xenophon* should be mentioned. Hercher certainly atticized the language of his texts. Düring's *Chion of Heraclea* is a modern critical edition with useful linguistic notes, whatever we may think of Düring's views about the date of this work.

One linguistic source does not seem to have been exploited—the Graeco-Latin glossaries in Loewe and Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ii–iii. These glossaries are usually put in the third century and sometimes contain valuable evidence on the meaning of Greek words. Thus the gloss, *endofestabat εσαινεν, ωργιζετο* (ii, 61. 37) supports the view which gives a wider range of meaning to *σαίνειν*. The following entries under *α* are relevant to Bauer: *ἀγρός, ἀδρανής, ἀιφνίδιος, ἀκμήν, ἀμφιβάλλειν, ἀναγωγεύς* cf. *ἀναγωγή, ἀνεξίκακος, ἀνοχή, ἀξιόπιστος, ἀπατᾶν* and *ἀπάτη, ἁπλῶ, ἀπόκοπος, ἀπόνοια, ἀπταιστος, ἅρπαξ, ἄρτι*. There may be further information in the Graeco-Latin glossaries in Pack, *Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Egypt*, 2351–57.

The ancient Greek lexicons such as Phrynichus have been regularly exploited. Some indication is usually given of the first author to use a word and the kind of authors who employ it. We ask, however, for more. Thus, *ὡσεί* appears to be a poetical word. Except for two occurrences in Xenophon it does not occur in prose writers of the Classical and early Hellenistic period. Again, it would be valuable to know what the Greeks of the Empire regarded as Attic. Thus, it would be instructive to have the gist of Moeris' note on *εὐλαβεῖσθαι* under this word. Reference from time to time to Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, would have been helpful. A. Dain, Le "Philetaeros", should be included in the list of texts.

It is a nice question how far a lexicon should go in the reporting of differences of usage among the authors with whom it is concerned. Bauer gives us some information of this kind; for example, under *καθώς*. More can be given. Thus, there are no firm examples of *ὡσεί* outside Luke-Acts, nor of *ἅπαξ* outside of Luke-Acts, Ephesians and James. These differences become more important with words like *νομικός* and *γραμματεύς, εὐαγγέλιον* and *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*.

In the main the articles on grammatical words are sound and well arranged. Under *ἑαυτοῦ* we are rightly reminded that the present practice of editors is to avoid the contracted reflexive *αὑτοῦ*. The editions still have to attain consistency on this point, but we should remove Westcot and Hort's exceptions despite Moulton. I do not find under either *αὐτός* or *ἑαυτοῦ* a reference to the reflexive use of *αὐτόν* which may occur in such passages as Gal. 6. 8, Eph. 4. 16, 1 Thess. 2. 11, 5. 13, James 1. 26, Rev. 8. 6, 18. 7.

It is difficult to know how far a lexicon ought to go in giving literature. Bauer is extraordinarily valuable for this, including articles in periodicals and discussions in commentaries in its range. We have noted the occasional neglect of literature from outside Germany. It is noticeable that a volume like Michel on Hebrews in Meyer's *Kommentar* seems to be ignored. P. 373 in this commentary, for example, has some interesting remarks on *ὁ λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως*.

These peripheral comments may remind us that the lexicography of the New Testament and other early Christian writings is on the move. Discoveries are still possible from the pagan literature, the Christian commentators, the papyri and the ancient versions. The study of material already in hand, in particular the study of text and language together, is full of promise. The student of the New

Testament will soon realize that in this field the age of discoveries is not over.

This recognition does not prevent us from realizing how fortunate we are in having Bauer. If our own studies do not make this clear to us, the use that papyrologists, students of the LXX and of later Greek literature are glad to make of our lexicon should awaken us to this fact. When we turn to other texts, such as the LXX, where no comparable lexicon is available, we are made aware of our unique good fortune.

G. D. Kilpatrick

The Sin and Fate of Sodom

One by-product of the debate on the Wolfenden Report has been to bring into newspaper and platform controversy the sin and the fate of Sodom. It is a far cry, morally and intellectually, from the taboos and customs of a Bronze Age community in the Near East to the laws and standards of a present-day Christian nation in Europe. To the modern—and the Christian—mind, the Pentateuch is full of precepts and practices that would be intolerable in a civilized society, though it also contains gems of wisdom of enduring value. Civilized modern Christians can certainly argue—as many did at the Church Assembly last year—that the law of Britain should continue to punish criminally homosexual relations between adult men, even when consented and private. But they throw their own case away if they seek support for it in the Bible story of the destruction of Sodom. To suppose that this story contradicts the Wolfenden report is to misunderstand the story itself and to misread its moral.

Archaeological research confirms the probable existence of Sodom and the other "Cities of the Plain", and the likelihood of their devastation by some sudden natural disaster. But it suggests some more mundane reason for that disaster than the wrath of God at the inhabitants' iniquity. In his book on *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition,* Dr Sherwin Bailey has argued convincingly that there is nothing in the story, even taken at its face value, to suggest that the iniquities which evoked divine anger were those sexual practices which subsequently took their name from Sodom, or indeed sexual aberrations of any sort. Ezekiel, in fact, describes the sins of Sodom as "pride, fulness of bread, and prosperous ease", together with idolatry (which the Authorized Version renders as "abomination"). According to Dr Bailey, it was not until the second century before Christ that certain apocryphal and apocalyptic Jewish writers, for reasons remote from any desire for historical accuracy, began to suggest a homosexual explanation of the sins of Sodom. And it was only in the first century after Christ, through the writings of "Enoch", Philo of Alexandria and Josephus, that this explanation gained wide currency among the Jews. It spread from them to the Christians—Clement of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Augustine and other Fathers of the Church "entertained no doubt whatever that the Sodomites were peculiarly and inordinately addicted to homosexual

practices, and that they were punished on this account"—and has remained, uncritically accepted, in the Christian tradition ever since.

Even scholars who feel that Dr Bailey may be somewhat too positive must agree, as Calvin did, that the evidence for the traditional view of the Sodom story is extremely tenuous. On the other hand, it is unquestionable that homosexual conduct is condemned as sinful in both the Old and the New Testaments. Yet, significantly, there is no instance where that condemnation is supported by any reference to the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. The "Holiness Code" of Leviticus declares: "If a man lie with mankind, as with womankind, both of them . . . shall surely be put to death". Henry VIII's Act of 1533 (still on the statute book, though with a milder penalty) is virtually a paraphrase of this text. But this was the Old Law which Christianity inherited and transformed. The New Law, which is directly pertinent to Christian conduct, is expressed in St Paul's declaration that those who resort to homosexual practices, like adulterers, drunkards, and other sinners, shall not "inherit the kingdom of God". This is, moreover, exactly the point of the Sodom story, if taken traditionally as a judgment on homosexual acts. It shows the Lord punishing a sin with heavenly fire, not the State punishing a crime with *vindices flammae,* hanging, or imprisonment.

Precisely this view was taken by the Church so long as it regulated the morals of the laity. Dr Bailey has done a real service in establishing that the Church's tradition was firmly founded on the teachings of St Paul, not on those of a primitive non-Christian code perhaps some seven centuries older. Until the Reformation it was the spiritual not the temporal authority which judged homosexual conduct; and its penalties were those befitting to a sin against the faith, not those appropriate to a breach of the criminal law. It was Henry VIII, probably for the extraneous political purpose of preparing the way for the dissolution of the monasteries, who stepped back from St Paul to Leviticus and turned a sin into a crime. It is hardly fair for Christians to reproach the Wolfenden committee for preferring the New Testament to the Old.

F. Lafitte.

---

1 Corinthians 13

A PARAPHRASE AD CLERUM

I MAY be the greatest popular preacher of a generation, commanding the attention of an enthusiastic congregation, or an outstandingly successful parish priest to whom hundreds come for counsel, but if I lack love my words are empty noise.

I may be counted among the most learned theologians or I may be regarded as an outstandingly farsighted ecclesiastical statesman; I may be without equal in my refusal to be discouraged by the challenge of the world, in my confidence in the final victory of the Gospel, in my opposition to scientific determinism; but if I lack love I amount to nothing at all in the sight of God.

I may be ready to take the most demanding vows, to give up every-

thing I possess for the sake of Christ, to undertake the most arduous and dangerous missionary service, to go anywhere the Church sends me; yet if I have not love I shall achieve precisely nothing.

Love puts up with continual interruptions, however much they interfere with the day's work, and is always ready to show kindness to the most irritating parishioner; love is never like a bear with a sore head.

Love does not begrudge the ability which others possess and he lacks; love does not always want a change of job or desire the preferment which comes to others; love is not always concerned to receive credit for good work well done, to ensure that his qualities are noted in the right quarters; love is not hurt if he is passed over or if his gifts are not appreciated.

Love is never roused to answer back bitterly, to create a scene, to demand his rights; love does not press his own interests at the expense of others, or think first of what he can get out of every situation; love does not view things from the point of his own advantage, or manipulate affairs to serve his own purposes.

Love does not render evil for evil, lose his temper when he is misunderstood or misrepresented, give as good as he gets, or return anger for anger; love suffers fools gladly, passes over offences against himself, forgives and forgets personal insults, doesn't worry about being abused or even about being ignored.

Love is not glad when others get into trouble, when a bad lot receives his deserts; love does not say "I told you so" when his worst fears are realized, or take any satisfaction when people suffer through ignoring his advice; love is glad when truth prevails even if it proves him mistaken, even if the curate turns out to be a better preacher than he is himself.

Love puts up with all sorts of indignities, with all kinds of irritations, with the petty trouble of old women and the infuriating obstinacy of the churchwardens, with the bishop's continual demands and with the refusal of the diocesan synod to see his point of view.

Love never loses faith in the power of God, never gives a young man up as a bad job, never loses heart when an appeal or a special anniversary proves a disappointment, when the promise of a move or an assistant curate falls through, when the youth club seems more interested in amusement than in religion, when the new convert backslides, when his server decides not to be ordained, when the treasurer absconds with the funds, when the altar guild divides into two camps, or when the sidesmen won't speak to each other.

Love always sees beyond the immediate problem to the sure hope of Christ, never allows the pressure of business or duty to get him down, is never overwhelmed with the fear that our civilization may be doomed, never over anxious about the future of the Church, never depressed by apparent failure or passing crises, never unready to start again.

Love is never at the end of its tether, never tested beyond its powers, never caught off guard, never without a solution.

Love can never be dispensed with. In contrast to prophecy (which

looks to the future), in contrast to tongues (which belong to this world), in contrast to knowledge (which depends on revelation), love is permanent and eternal—the fullest and the most vital work of the Spirit. Our experience of the vision of God will one day make both knowledge and prophecy superfluous; but love is something beyond which you cannot graduate. Love is greater even than faith and hope. These are our true relationship *to* God, but love *is* God.

R. F. HETTLINGER.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Alan Ecclestone is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Darnall, Sheffield.

The Rev. H. A. Williams is a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Dr Moule is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Dr Kilpatrick is Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford.

Mr Lafitte is a journalist who specializes in social questions.

The Rev. R. F. Hettlinger is a Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

CORRESPONDENCE

CONFIRMATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The chief merits of the Bishop of Worcester's article on Confirmation are that it offers no universal panacea, that it avoids the pastoral escapism of so much that is written on the subject nowadays, and that it plainly recognizes that the many problems associated with contemporary practice can be satisfactorily approached only in terms of existing Church communities. The clergy of the diocese of Worcester may count themselves fortunate to have a bishop who shares the sense of uneasiness and unreality which so many parish priests feel when the annual Confirmation comes round. It is only too painfully easy to dot the "i"s and cross the "t"s of what the Bishop writes, by reference to particular boys and girls for whom one is pastorally concerned.

Every priest over the years develops his own special techniques, and has his own pet ideas, of what to do. But nobody in his right mind can claim to be satisfied either with what he would like to be able to do, or with what his parish will do in the matter. Most of us just soldier on from year to year, hoping and praying that this or that boy or girl will remain faithful, being thankful for apparent success and penitent for obvious failure. And might it not be that this is just what God requires from us at this particular stage of human history? Are we not in danger of being infected by the pre-

vailing secular notion that all human situations are capable of being reduced to clearly stated problems, to which definitive answers can be found? Must we not rather learn to live with issues the edges of which are blurred, and always will be until the consummation of all things? We must never forget that the treasure we have is in earthen vessels, "that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us". In the present interim dispensation of the Church, in which we sinners live and work, it would be quite monstrous if a perfect solution to the problems of Confirmation—or indeed to any other problem—could be found. This is not to say that we should acquiesce in what is wrong, but that like the Bishop we should learn to be disturbed to penitence. And we should then go on loving John and Jill and Frank and Mary, and their parents and godparents and the whole Church community—wrestling with them, as we struggle for our own integrity "till we *all* come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ". In short, there can be no solution to the problem which the Bishop poses, in this present time. We can do now this and now that, hoping for inprovement here and there, and being mindful of the conventions of our parishes. This is not a counsel of despair, nor of indolent acquiescence in what is unsatisfactory and wrong; it is a plea to recognize the judgment of God in our present situation, and to be penitent.

At this time of year, I begin again the final preparation for our Confirmation—the candidates are interviewed, parents and godparents are seen, parish organizations and the P.C.C. are alerted, there are references in sermons and the parish magazine, and hope once again runs high. And then I look through the lists of those confirmed even in recent years, the boys and girls whom I see going to school every day or just starting out to work. It is then that I know that I must resist the temptation to dull the voice of conscience which calls to repentance, by a noisy tearing down of the fabric and a busy erection of something new. We are not likely to say to our flocks "Peace, peace; when there is no peace"; but we are in danger of attempting to heal the hurt of God's people slightly, by imagining that mere reformation will do much.

Yours sincerely,
ERIC WILD.

HINDLEY VICARAGE,
WIGAN.
29 *July* 1958.

THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO THE EAST

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The first step in giving effect to the suggestion made in the article on the above subject in the July number of THEOLOGY would, I take it, be the intensive study of at least selected texts in the native languages. Taking Tamil as an example, very little of its literature has so far been explored by European scholars. A century ago, when

Caldwell issued the first edition of his *Comparative Grammar* (1856), he gave it as his opinion that a short poem on morals by a Hindu monk of the sixteenth century, based on the *Kural*, was the most notable contribution to Tamil literature, because, apparently, an English translation of it by Stokes (1830) was available at the time. A couple of years later, Pope, in his edition of a native grammar, told the student that the older grammar on which the one he had edited (with English captions) was based would not repay the labour of perusal. Though learned editions of both grammars by competent native scholars now exist, these as well as learned editions of the classics would still appear to await detailed study in the West, though available in libraries such as that of the British Museum.

Yours faithfully,

14 Norman Avenue,
Twickenham.

M. S. H. Thompson.

ANGLICANS AND REUNION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Having just read, in your June issue, Bishop Newbigin's article on "Anglicans and Christian Union" I can only say how heartily I find myself in agreement with it, and how earnestly many must hope that his plea will be heeded.

On the question of the relation between inter-communion and concern for unity, however, I note that Bishop Newbigin generally endorses the view that "free churchmen, who practised unrestricted inter-communion, showed on the whole so little concern about organic union".

This opinion is so frequently expressed as almost to be established as beyond debate; but I seriously ask if the facts will bear it out. Has anyone, for instance, taken note of the information tabulated on pp. 496–505 of Rouse and Neill's *History of the Ecumenical Movement*? Here are recorded no fewer than thirty-four examples of *Organic Union* actually being achieved between the years 1910 and 1952, many of them involving more than two churches and fifteen of them "Trans-Confessional". Of these, however, it would seem likely that all except one (the Church of South India) took place among bodies which had in fact been practising inter-communion. If the record were brought down to this year, several more examples would have to be added to the list.

When one reflects on the very formidable barrier which the refusal of inter-communion does indeed interpose in negotiations for union, and on this evidence of how many bodies have in fact gone on from inter-communion to organic union, one must raise the question of whether the assumption that the Anglican practice does lead to a greater urgency in the matter than the other is justified.

Yours sincerely,

Serampore College,
W. Bengal.
25 *July* 1958.

William Stewart.

TRAINING FOR A PROPHETIC MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Mr Neville ("Training for a Prophetic Ministry", in your August number) should go in for a little "engagement, confrontation . . . should be faced with, indeed involved in", the philosophy department of a "provincial university within reach", Leeds. There he would meet Prof. Stephen Toulmin and Mr A. C. MacIntyre.

If Mr Neville were then to repeat his intense desire to cultivate the prophetic faculty "by a patient study of contemporary society through the disciplines of sociology", I can imagine what Stephen Toulmin would say, what he once said in a B.B.C. talk, I suppose—"I remember the late Humphrey House declaring how much more hope there would have been for the Churches if the clergy had taken on their own shoulders many of the burdens now falling—for lack of any other agent—on our unfortunate sub-postmasters. Pensions, family allowances, welfare milk and orange juice are the present-day symbols of the brotherhood of man; and their distribution would have combined happily with pastoral visiting—indeed would have given it a real point."

Mr Neville's definition of prophecy "is simply the ability to appraise and interpret the life of society in the light of God's known will". Mr MacIntyre would tell him in one sentence how irrelevant the will of God is to the measurements of social science and psychology.

"A parallel study of Marx and the Bible!" A very short thesis, indeed, for a researcher who entered that Virgin Land.

Mr Neville may be looking forward to a College of Prophecy affiliated to the L.S.E. There is no evidence in his article that it could be described as Theological.

Yours faithfully,
E. O. JONES.

CHURCH HOUSE,
RETFORD, NOTTS.
31 *July* 1958.

THE BLESSING AT THE EUCHARIST

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Dr Blagrave's article in your issue for August is assertive but unconvincing, for he provides little factual support for his opinion, and much of what he appears to provide is not fact at all. Moreover, he does not seem to understand the views which he is criticizing. Exception must be taken both to his statements of fact and also to the presuppositions upon which his argument rests.

(1) Dr Blagrave writes: "The word 'bless' does not occur in the prayers of consecration." Yet the Liturgy of St Mark prays that God will fill this sacrifice with his *blessing*. Basil prays that the Spirit may come upon these oblations and *bless* them. The Armenian rite asks

that God will send forth his Spirit "by whom *blessing* this bread thou wilt make it truly the body . . .". Addai and Mari asks that the Spirit may rest upon this offering and *bless* and hallow it. And the Roman Canon of the Mass prays both that God will accept these offerings and *bless* them, and also that he will make the oblation *benedictam*.

(2) In his fourth paragraph, Dr Blagrave says that it does not necessarily follow that the thanksgiving "was to be the moment of blessing in the Christian Society". He goes on to ask what we mean by blessing and to answer his question by saying that it is "the imparting of something to the person or person blessed". This is an example of getting the wrong answer by asking the wrong question. The question should be: What did the Jews mean by blessing? The answer to this, so far as the N.T. writers is concerned, is that they meant thanksgiving, as is shown by the use both of *eulogeo* and of *eucharisteo* in describing the Lord's prayer at the Supper. Jews did not bless (or ask God to bless) *things*: they blessed *God*—for things which he had given.

(3) In the same paragraph, Dr Blagrave illustrates his idea of the blessing as asking for the presence of the Lord by referring to the consecration of a church. At this rite, he says, by the prayers of the faithful God vouchsafes his presence to the building. But this is certainly not what the "prayers of the faithful" ask for in the Roman, Gallican, Slavonic, Armenian or Coptic rites. Nor is there any reference in these rites to the "reality enshrined in Jacob's vision". They are silent about Jacob, except for the Gallican use of Gen. 28. 18 in connexion with the consecration of the *altar*. The prayers for the church building know nothing of these ideas.

(4) In the following paragraph, Dr Blagrave reconstructs the service of the first Sunday after Easter in the year of the Resurrection in support of his own theory of the consecratory importance of the "words of identification". But he produces no evidence to support his reconstruction, and alternatives could be produced which are equally plausible.

It is not clear from Dr Blagrave's article what practical conclusions he draws from his theory. I hope I have shown that the theory is without foundation. But what if it were true? We could not be content to go on using the "words of identification" simply in the narrative of the Last Supper. We should at least have to add a solemn recital of them between the Fraction and the Communion; and it is probable that Dr Blagrave's theory would require us to separate the thanksgiving over the bread and the cup, adding the solemn saying of the "words of identification" after the breaking of the bread and the thanksgiving over the cup respectively. Is this what Dr Blagrave wants?

Yours faithfully,
BERNARD WIGAN.

LITTLE BERKHAMSTED RECTORY,
HERTFORD.

BOOK REVIEWS

ONE LORD, ONE CHURCH. By J. Robert Nelson. World Christian Books. 2s. 6d.

MEMBERS ONE OF ANOTHER. Aspects of Koinonia. By J. G. Davies. Mowbray. 3s.

THE RECOVERY OF UNITY. A Theological Approach. By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 25s.

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND THE UNITY WE SEEK. By Albert C. Outler. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

All the books in this varied batch show urgent concern for Christian unity, though they vary considerably in their size and purpose. The World Christian Books series has established itself in providing simple expositions of big themes by expert writers: Dr Robert Nelson, until recently the Secretary of "Faith and Order" on the World Council staff, has produced a short and clear exposition of why the problem of Christian unity cannot be ignored, has a chapter on the distinction between "diversity" and "division" (to clear the common confusion between "uniformity" and "unity"), skims through ancient and modern history, and finishes with "twelve vital questions" which make the book a useful one for groups of laymen in discussion.

Dr Davies' pamphlet is the printing of four lectures in which intelligent lay-workers were taken to school under D. F. Hauck and L. S. Thornton, whilst the schoolmaster worked in a few good points of his own not to be found either in the *Wörterbuch* article or in *The Common Life*. In particular, this little book is worth reading for the clear exegesis which brings out the inter-relations and inter-dependence of *Koinonia*, mission, Eucharist and *diakonia* as aspects of one living fellowship in Christ and the Spirit.

Dr Mascall's book is the largest and stiffest of the four, though it is principally a gathering-together and re-statement of themes which he has touched on elsewhere. (If he is not careful he will be getting into the Barth class for output of theological wordage.) The central thesis is one which was first adumbrated by the group of "Anglo-Catholic" theologians, of which he was a member, who produced the pamphlet *Catholicity*, at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1945. Dr Mascall sums it up as the conviction "that it is futile to try to heal our Western divisions unless we are all of us prepared to go behind the Reformation controversies, and indeed behind the Middle Ages as well, in order to seek the primitive wholeness of Christian faith and life". This thesis is worked out principally in terms of a lengthy critique of the inadequacy of much Protestant theology, which cannot give the right answers because it is prevented from seeing the right problems because Luther was a Nominalist. It could obviously be a worthy battle for the experts to judge of the sense in which that is true; an article in THEOLOGY (June 1956, No. 432) by Bengt Haegglund entitled "Was Luther a

Nominalist?" suggested to the non-expert that Dr Mascall's case is not self-evident. Neither does he pay any attention to those who would assert equally firmly that biblical truth cannot be re-stated, without serious distortion of its essential meaning, in the Aristotelian categories of Thomism. But apart from the philosophical battle about ontology, is there not also a question how far the essential task of Christian thinkers is to seek to penetrate through the forms of expression, whatever they may be, to the experienced reality which transcends all the forms? It is the occasional, partial discovery that this can be done which bestows a breath-taking wonder upon the converse of "separated Christians" with one another.

But, as Dr Mascall's chapters richly unfold, every reader will be grateful for flashes of insight upon this or that aspect of a big theme and provoked to ask his own questions, e.g. How is the insistence upon the Church as being only incidentally "the Church militant" and chiefly the Church "expectant and triumphant" to be related to the concept of "the Kingdom"? If the Church is incorporation into the *glorified* Body of Christ, how far does the phrase "extension of the Incarnation" really convey that? There are two chapters on "the Rediscovery of the Liturgy" rather repeating themes from his earlier book, *Corpus Christi*, and rather labouring Nominalism again, but concluding with a fine section on the interpretation of the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Dean of Winchester's *Old Priest and New Presbyter* is subjected to a searching criticism for confusing "the Anglican appeal to history" with "the appeal to Anglican history"; the claims of the Papacy are scrutinized and rejected in the two final chapters. The whole book is offered in a spirit of charity, seasoned with salt, which makes it a most readable and valuable, if somewhat rambling and repetitive, contribution to "theological re-integration".

The last of these four books is much shorter and slighter, but in digging into the true meaning of "tradition", Prof. Outler is at work on precisely the task Dr Mascall commends. The writer, speaking originally to American theological students, takes the modern ecumenical movement as his starting-point. He sees its significance as lying in the fact that it keeps the right order of priorities: Christ-Event, Christian community, Christian doctrine. That is to say that Jesus Christ, the essential *Paradosis, the* "handing-over" from the Father to man, creates that community in which the "actus tradendi" from age to age is the work of the Holy Spirit communicating that essential "traditum" (the gift of love and grace in Jesus Christ). Somewhere in the resulting *traditions* is to be discerned the common tradition, and it is the distinguishing glory of the ecumenical movement that it holds men together in loyalty to Jesus Christ whilst they face the strain and stress of self-criticism and mutual criticism through which alone the Holy Spirit will enable us to distinguish between our traditions and his tradition. It is a small book but a highly suggestive one.

Oliver Tomkins.

Lincoln.

THE COUNTRY CLERGY IN ELIZABETHAN AND STUART TIMES: 1558–1660. By A. Tindal Hart. Phoenix House. 21s.

Happy in the date of its publication, this is a book of the month—the month of May, when the country parson comes into his own. It is a book to take into the garden and there, under a spreading chestnut or leafy beech, while the cuckoo says his piece and the drift of lilac blossom comes over the hedge, the vicar may turn the pages and muse upon Time past when his predecessors endured or rejoiced in their day and generation. The long odds are that if not his own parish at least his locality will be found pinpointed as the tale unfolds and the procession passes:

> A hundred vicars down the lawn,
> Curates long dust . . .
> The sly shade of a Rural Dean . . .

erring archdeacons and idle canons—the illustrative examples are numberless and gathered from a wide range of sources.

Only the really rural cleric of to-day, declining to his rest in one of the few remaining pockets of rural England, will believe, understand and forgive. Since what Jessop termed "the abysmal ignorance of the townsman of country ways and thoughts" is still a major source of misunderstanding in high places, here lies some part of the value of this survey. Thus few clergy of to-day go quite as far as the vicar of Milton, Cambs., who entertained his morning congregation with drink so strong as to cause scandal among the more puritanical faithful, yet sherry parties after matins are not unknown and memory is still green of the incumbent of a Wiltshire parish where the landlord refused to serve any refreshment on a Sunday until the vicar had arrived from church and had been first served. Drink and drunkenness, inns and alehouses, indeed, loom large in this survey of two centuries. Lincolnshire seems to have been a very "wet" diocese, though Ely runs it close. The hunting parson has almost gone, but rarer still would be the P.C.C. which, like the churchwardens of one parish, provided its vicar with two surplices—one to pray in and one to hunt in. Unprofessional employments, mainly agricultural, account for many delations of parson to bishop, as when the rector of Wootton Rivers was so tired with pitching corn on Saturday that he must rest on Sunday. But, as the author justly reminds us, much of the evidence, whether in Elizabethan or Laudian or Cromwellian times, comes from hostile witnesses. Nor were the parsons always the villains of the piece; Dr Hart brings out only too clearly the hostility and brutality of squire, farmer and churchwarden towards incumbents of a different school of thought than their own. That applies especially to the evictions of the Interregnum though, as Dr Hart's previous volume helped us to see, the rabbling of the parson and the burning of the parsonage was almost a commonplace public entertainment in any decade from 1600 to 1800. As he says, let it be remembered that the "Puritan" trooper was often enough little better than a blackguard or ruffian in uniform. Even in quieter times the rural populace merited Herrick's short descrip-

tion of his parishioners, "rude as rudest savages". Other problems not even yet altogether solved are seen emerging as Reformation and Restoration arrive and unfold—clerical povery, impropriations, unpaid tithe and unfruitful glebe, non-residence and pluralities—on all of which the author's comments are at least revelatory of his scholarship and practical experience.

There are, of course, severe limits to the usefulness of a book of this kind; history, like current politics, must deal with man in the mass; it must provide some distinctions into classes, types, schools; statistics such as A. G. Matthews worked out on the evictions; differences as between moderate men and rigid party men, and so on. However, these things have been done elsewhere—for the Laudian movement by R. S. Bosher, and for the intricacies of theories and polities over a longer period in the three volumes of W. K. Jordan. It would be ungracious to complain of the omission of material outside Dr Hart's plan and purpose. He and his publishers have provided a feast of good things; the long lists of reference are perhaps too elaborate and might be compressed with advantage, but in the main only the print, somewhat trying to tired eyes, comes between the reader in the deckchair and his unalloyed pleasure in watching an experienced narrator manipulating his puppetry.

W. G. Addison.

Britford, Wilts.

The Independents in the English Civil War. By George Yule. Melbourne University Press and Cambridge University Press. 21s.

Bishop and Presbytery. The Church of Scotland, 1661–88. By W. R. Foster. Published for the Church Historical Society, S.P.C.K. 25s.

The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland. By F. R. Bolton. Published for the Church Historical Society, S.P.C.K. 45s.

Here are three books about Christianity in seventeenth-century Britain. The first is a model piece of historical research, exact, limited, courteously critical of other scholars, and with some conclusions, not too definite, of its own, which point the way to further research. Mr Yule studies the "godly gang", the Independent members of Parliament during the Civil War and Interregnum. They were not, in the main, sectaries and they wished to maintain something of the traditional relation between church and state, at least at the parochial level. It could be argued that the most striking element of continuity in English religion has been its Erastianism, and the Independent M.P.s, drawn from sections of the gentry which had not profited financially under the king, and aware of the benefits of patronage and impropriate tithe, were no exception. Yet in spite of this evidence which would support the Marxist interpretation of the Civil War, Mr Yule concludes that a neat sociological pattern

does not emerge and that the Independent M.P.s did act from religious conviction at certain crucial moments, and that they did believe (within very strict limits which excluded the majority of their fellow-countrymen) in religious toleration in "a happy, bishopless Eden".

The other two books are of more topical interest and no less scholarly. Mr Foster gives us a fascinating study of a period of Scottish church history during which episcopal order was wedded to a presbyterian discipline and Calvinist doctrine (with varieties of doctrinal emphasis)—and worked reasonably well. True, it would be a mistake to expect to find typical Anglicanism here. The pastoral use of the rite of confirmation, for example, was practically non-existent. Nevertheless, in the least propitious circumstances, a church existed which had real bishops, a well-educated clergy, a severe standard of moral discipline, strictly enforced, a vigorous parish life and the presbyterian system of kirk sessions and synods—and (except in the south-west) was acceptable to the "generality of the people". What did the bishops do? They ordained, preached, supervised the clergy, with powers of suspension, deprivation and excommunication and provided both formal and informal courts of appeal.

Mr Foster maintains that there was a greater synthesis of the two forms of polity than has sometimes been recognized, and that episcopacy was by no means regarded merely as an alien imposition. Thus he questions the accepted mythology of Scottish history. In view of the topicality of the theme, it is of interest to note his conclusions that the possession of an episcopal succession did not alter the worship or the doctrine of the Scottish Church in the least particular, and that the relations between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England remained ambiguous. Episcopally ordained clergy were recognized in the south, but "no data have been discovered which indicates whether Englishmen made their communions in Scotland. The Eucharist was celebrated on such rare occasions that there would have been little opportunity to do so".

Mr Bolton's book covers more ground than its title suggests, and is in fact a study of the Irish Anglican tradition down to the nineteenth century. His study is an apologia, and he writes with enthusiasm for a continuing tradition of impressive scholarship and church-consciousness, and with occasional asperity towards those modern Anglicans who do not share his enthusiasm. He has a good account of Archbishop Ussher, and brings out his real importance as scholar and ecclesiastic; and he writes with special reference to Jeremy Taylor, supplementing our knowledge of him. There are interesting and informative chapters on Irish teaching on the Ministry and Sacraments, and on liturgical practice, the furnishing of churches and their consecration. The book will be especially useful to any following the trail blazed by Canon Addleshaw in *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship*. Much space is given to the 1666 form for the consecration of churches, and its author practically proved to be Jeremy Taylor. The Church of Ireland has been hardly treated by historians and too little esteemed by ordinary churchmen in

England. Mr Bolton paints an attractive picture of a churchmanship solidly based on patristic learning and expressed in careful and dignified ritual—and one, moreover, which might, but for political upheavals, have converted the people of Ireland. For we are apt to forget that in the sixteenth century the Irish still thought of Rome as an alien authority, and were driven into enthusiastic Roman Catholicism by English ineptitude. This book disproves at least the first half of Archbishop Magee's epigram that for three hundred years the Church of Ireland has been a Church without church principles, and now consists of church principles without a church. On the contrary, it describes a remarkably consistent tradition of high churchmanship over the whole period. It is a book of more than ordinary value to anyone who is interested in Caroline churchmanship for its own sake, or who thinks that modern Anglicanism can still learn from it.

R. Cant.

York.

"But I am a Catholic!" By Oscar Hardman. S.P.C.K. 5s. 6d.

Anglicanism does not lend itself readily, like Roman Catholicism, to propaganda by slogans. To the zealous Roman convert *But I am a Catholic!* is both sword for attack and shield for defence. The Anglican has no riposte on the tip of his tongue: either he concedes the point, or he must attempt to justify a definition of the word "Catholic" which shall make it applicable to himself. Dr Hardman has marked the jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood by writing this book to help members of the Anglican Communion to appreciate their Catholic heritage, and to give an answer to those who dispute it.

He defines Catholicity in terms of Creeds, Sacraments, Apostolic Ministry and Holy Scripture; and has no difficulty in showing the loyalty of the Church of England and its daughter churches to them. In the main, his argument is a spirited attack on the Papal claims of infallibility and universal jurisdiction. He examines and rejects the Scriptural evidence alleged to support these claims, traces their historical development, points to acts of individual popes inconsistent with so high an authority, and accuses Rome of adding to the Faith and of being responsible for the break up of Christendom.

It is an advocate's case, presented with skill and vigour; but it invites a rejoinder. A more sympathetic consideration of some of the arguments would clear the ground of unprofitable disputations on matters of inevitable doubt while leaving the vital issues open to attack. Dr Oscar Cullmann has given a more favourable verdict on the Scriptural evidence for St Peter's apostolic primacy, Dr T. G. Jalland on the evidence for associating that primacy with the bishop of Rome. The first four General Councils, which, as Dr Hardman rightly mentions, are among the standards for determining doctrine to which the Church of England appeals, allow a primacy to the bishop of Rome as the successor and mouthpiece of St Peter. The

real objection to the Papal prerogatives as they are now defined is either that they mean nothing at all or that they can hardly be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. They involve the operation at the focal centre of the Church's organization of an uncovenanted means of grace. In practice they are proving to be of little real benefit. On the other hand, one should be alert to discern the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the parts into which Christendom is divided in spite of, and perhaps by means of, the distortions in each due to its separation from the rest. The ultimate test of authenticity is the fruit of holiness. Holiness is an oft-forgotten mark of the Church: where it abounds the true Church cannot be far away. If a particular Church comes under judgment it must be by the measure of its saints, not of its sinners.

Severe as Dr Hardman's criticisms are, he is nevertheless on the side of those who "are bound to include Rome in their vision of the one, true and indefectible Church of Christ, as it was at the first. . . ." For this culmination he looks, not very confidently, to change in changing Rome. Must there not, too, be change in Anglicanism, in Orthodoxy, and in Protestantism? We are all under God. The book provides a popular survey of the classical Anglican-Roman argument which should prove useful to those exposed to polemical attack; at 5s. 6d. it is good value for money.

K. A. Pearson.

Ewhurst Rectory,
Robertsbridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Book of Daniel. By E. W. Heaton. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Canon Heaton's Introduction and Commentary on the book of Daniel is an important contribution to the Torch Bible Commentaries now being produced by the S.C.M. Press. As he says in his Preface, "Few books of the Bible need a commentary as much as the book of Daniel. . . . Equally, few books of the Old Testament deserve a commentary as much as the book of Daniel and merit the serious attention of Christians."

It is still possible in the popular press to come across examples of "that fanciful and fanatical misinterpretation which has come near to bringing the work into disrepute". I remember reading in a national daily during the last war an article claiming that Daniel chapter 11 contained unmistakable references to the then German Chancellor. No doubt the references there to "a contemptible person" described the feelings of many in this country and elsewhere for Hitler, but such writings have to be clearly understood and carefully explained so that phrases and ideas are not wrested out of their context.

The present work, as others of the series, is designed for the general reader, but it is to be hoped that all will avail themselves of

the most helpful, if lengthy, Introduction as well as the Commentary itself, which as the writer suggests can be treated separately.

The arrangement of the book is very convenient and should satisfy the needs of a variety of readers and students. Canon Heaton accepts the second century B.C. background for the book and thinks that the author was a scribe or wise man; he might later have been described as a Hasid, or later still as a Doctor of Divinity. The hero is regarded as a legendary figure with whom the author seems to have to some extent identified himself. There are useful chapters on the type of literature to which the book of Daniel belongs, references to the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which may have been connected with the circles in which this book of the Bible was produced, and some helpful indications of the place and importance of the book in Jewish as well as in Christian religious thought.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.

C. WITTON-DAVIES.

JESUS' PROMISE TO THE NATIONS. By J. Jeremias. Studies in Biblical Thought, No. 24. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON THE LORD'S SUPPER. By O. Cullmann and J. Leenhardt. Ecumenical Studies in Worship. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

PREACHING THE CROSS. By J. C. Fenton. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Each of these three books, though small in compass, is rich in content and deserves a better fate than a composite review at the hands of a mere middle-man!

Since *The Parables of Jesus* and *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* appeared in English we reach eagerly for anything new or newly accessible from the fertile mind and pen of Prof. Jeremias. He describes the present work as having a twofold aim. "It is in the first place a New Testament study and secondly an examination of the basis of missionary activity." He finds that Jesus strongly condemned the contemporary energetic Jewish mission to the Gentiles, forbade his disciples to preach to them during his lifetime, and restricted his own activity to the people of Israel. Yet Jesus also removed the idea of vengeance from the eschatological expectation, promised the Gentiles a share in salvation, and declared that they were included in his redemptive work and his lordship. The determining positive idea of Jesus was the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God (Isa. 25. 6–8). The paradox is resolved in the organic connexion between the two attitudes. For "that the children must first be fed" and "that a ransom for many must first be paid" were the Divine pre-conditions of the Gentile mission which was itself the beginning of God's final act, an anticipation of the visible enthronement of the Son of Man.

I can only say that I learned a great deal from this book, especially from the first part, and consider it a "must".

Prof. Cullmann maintains that very early in the history of the Christian community two quite different conceptions of the Lord's

Supper were unified. The true origin of the primitive Eucharist is to be found in the tradition of the joyful meals eaten by the eleven with the Risen Christ. The expression "breaking of bread" in Luke–Acts is not primarily connected with the words of Jesus over the bread at the Last Supper. It was Paul who first created this link. "Faced with the excesses at Corinth he was forced to remind the faithful that it is not only the Risen One who, at the Lord's Supper, manifests himself to the community but also the Crucified One." The major weakness in this reconstruction is undoubtedly the complete omission of any reference to the Passover and of any discussion of Prof. Jeremias' rehabilitation of the Synoptic chronology. It is surely in the Paschal integration of joy and travail in the mind of Jesus himself at the Last Supper that we must seek the source of their integration in the Eucharistic tradition.

Much of what Prof. Leenhardt has to say in the second essay (entitled "This is my Body") is reminiscent of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns; for example, this sentence: "To the eye of the believer things are not only what observation and experiment declare them to be. Their final and essential nature depends upon their relation to God." In the course of a chapter courageously if provocatively entitled "Transubstantiation" the following sentence occurs: "If anyone is shocked that God acts by means of bread, why not also be shocked that he acts by means of air vibrations and eardrum?" This has long needed saying in Protestant circles (whether Continental or Anglo-Saxon). This essay represents a struggle to escape from confessional conditioning into the fullness of Christian tradition, a struggle which we can view only with sympathy, admiration, and the resolve to do likewise if necessary.

The purpose of Mr Fenton's 1955 Passiontide lectures at St Boniface College, Warminster, was "to try to read and understand Mark 14. 1–16. 8 as Mark meant it and as his first readers read it". The lecturer shares the growing dissatisfaction with the present form of the Three Hours' service; more especially he is, as a critical scholar, uncomfortable (as many are) with the conventional treatment of the Seven Words. He advocates the following of one Gospel alone so that the whole design of one particular Evangelist's Passion narrative may make its distinctive impact on the hearer. The lectures were intended as an essay in the preliminary work which the conscientious Good Friday preacher needs to do. Many of us agree with Mr Fenton in his desire to let the Gospel *be* the Gospel and supremely so on Good Friday. The kind of false "relevance" of which he gives horrifying examples on p. 3 is clearly indefensible. But the question then arises at what point *our* closed circle of biblical exposition may be expected to cut the other closed circle of our hearers' non-biblical thought-forms and attitudes. If Mr Fenton would share with us the practical companion piece which he must presumably have among his papers we should be both interested and grateful.

JOHN MONTAGUE.

CHESHUNT.

William Thomson, Archbishop of York. His Life and Times, 1819–90. By H. Kirk-Smith. S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 35s.

Archbishop Thomson has been mentioned with unusual frequency this year because of his refusal to take part in the first Lambeth Conference. Mr Kirk-Smith has made good use of extensive sources in the composition of this interesting biography of a not very interesting prelate. Thomson was a man of great physical height and wore a size eight hat, but it does not appear that his stature was in other respects commensurate. After a rapid series of preferments in early life he became Archbishop of York where, in a manner somewhat similar to that of Samuel Wilberforce, he was a "remodeller of the Episcopate". He was alive to some of the needs of the time and devoted much attention to the work of the Church in Sheffield. He was a quarrelsome man, and this book contains some curious examples of petty ecclesiastical animosity. About Thomson's intellectual disposition there is some obscurity. Mr Kirk-Smith gives credence to the story that he wrote a paper for *Essays and Reviews*, which was not included because it arrived too late. In the event he took a leading part in the attack on that volume. Anyhow, he excelled more as a man of action than as a man of thought.

A. R. V.

The Exilic Age. By Charles Francis Whitley. Longmans. 16s.

From time to time a really exhilarating and illuminating book on the Old Testament is published. This is one of them. It comes near to doing for the Exilic age what Edwyn Bevan's *Jerusalem under the High Priests* did for the Maccabean period.

"The sixth century was a period of intellectual awakening such as man had never experienced before, nor indeed was it equalled again till the age of the Reformation in the Christian era." It was the age of Thales, Anaximander and Xenophanes among the Greeks, Zoroaster in Persia and the Buddha in India. Greeks and Lydians, Medes and Persians as well as Egyptians and other peoples were in Babylon in the early sixth century. It is probable that Zoroastrianism was known in Babylon when Deutero-Isaiah was preaching there. "The Ionians were concerned with the search for the First Cause. Zoroastrianism accounted for the presence of good and evil in the world by the postulate of a dualism of light and darkness. Deutero-Isaiah solved the Ionic problem of creation by claiming that Yahweh is the sole Creator and Controller of the universe and the Zoroastrian problem of good and evil by his representation of Yahweh as Lord of the realms when moral and related problems arise: 'I am Yahweh and there is no other. I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe. I am Yahweh who do all these things'." "Recognizing that a new age, fraught with tremendous consequences for mankind, was being inaugurated he represents Yahweh as saying: 'Behold the former things have come to pass, and new things I now declare'."

Dr Whitley in his discussions of the date of Jeremiah's period of prophecy and the date and provenance of Ezekiel not only sums up what the experts have to say but he makes the discussion really illuminate and have bearing on the prophet's message. Too often this sort of thing is as dry as dust. It is very difficult to avoid being guided to Dr Whitley's conclusions. Jeremiah began to prophesy after the death of Josiah. Those parts of our present Jeremiah which seem to contradict this are a pious deceit to make the prophet seem to support the Deuteronomic reform which is in fact inconsistent with his own much more radical position. Ezekiel prophesied in Babylon at the traditional date of the beginning of the Exilic period and not in Palestine or at a previous or later period.

The Exilic Age is a valuable book for the clergyman who takes the Bible seriously. It is based on an extensive knowledge of available literature and is extremely useful for the bibliography in the footnotes.

Papworth Everard, Cambs. D. G. Hill.

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? By Oscar Cullmann. Epworth Press. 6s.

The author discloses that when this little book was published in French (it has also been delivered in English as a lecture at Harvard) it distressed a number of readers. Why? As professor of Early Christian religion, his sole aim, here as in his other writings, is to expound the faith in its pristine purity. It will not do, he implies, to regard Socrates in the way he has been regarded since the Renaissance—that is, as a virtual Christian. For the Christian hope is not his in the immortality of the soul following death but in the resurrection on the last day, and the resurrection of bodies as well as souls. For Socrates, death was release. On the Cross, death was the enemy to be overcome. The two beliefs are not open to being reconciled by such texts as "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise" (paradise is the resting-place in the nether world). Their incompatibility should be indisputable. How pointing it out can have given pain thus remains inexplicable. It can hardly be because, according to Prof. Cullmann, certain views of Barth, Brunner, Bultmann and some others assume that our hope is the hope of Socrates.

M. B.

Believing. By Herbert M. Waddams. Faith Press. 8s. 6d.

Theology for Beginners. By F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

These two manuals of instruction for a Christian form a pair of opposites. Not only are they contrasts in style or presentation, an Anglican clergyman using the idiom of a layman and a Roman layman writing like a cleric. They are also in direct contradiction.

As an active officer of the Catholic Evidence Guild, who is himself responsible for examining "great numbers of lay people who join the Guild in order to be trained for its work", Mr Sheed draws on the experience of a vigorous controversialist, while Canon Waddams presents teaching which has matured while he has been General Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations. They are in violent disagreement, and their two books are to be read as two sides of a debate which at present shows no indication of coming to an end. Thus, on infallibility: "without a teacher, who can tell us, beyond the possibility of error, which of the various meanings is Christ's, we should have no revelation but only an ever growing pile of conundrums" (Sheed), and "the idea of an infallible authority in the Church seems far from the spirit of Jesus as depicted in the New Testament. He taught fundamental truths about the love of God, but he scrupulously avoided doing anything or saying anything which would excuse a man from working out his own answers and decisions" (Waddams). Again, on the dogma of the Assumption: "Christ would want His Mother with Him in Heaven, not her soul only, but herself, body and soul. Any son would want that, and this was the one Son who could have what He wanted" (Sheed), and "there seems to be no historical evidence to support it, according to the normal canons of historical evidence" (Waddams). The contradictions continue throughout the two books, revealing a tragically vast divergence between the two points of view, affecting the whole range of pastoral care and apologetic, and pointing to an incompatibility which persists regardless of the desirability or otherwise of attempts to maintain summit talks between theologians of the two communions. This incompatibility cannot be overlooked by anyone who is attracted, or distracted, by the two-way traffic between Rome and Canterbury. It suggests that the distance is greater than is sometimes supposed.

The appearance of these particular publications more or less simultaneously may do good by frankly drawing attention to that situation. In fact, many of the paragraphs in the volume by Canon Waddams provide calm, concise and courteously reasoned answers to Roman assertions. It is a refreshing restatement of Christian belief which will be found most useful by parish clergy. But one general criticism: although sub-titled "a new look at the Nicene Creed", it holds only loosely to that formula and indeed states that that Creed begins with "I believe in God".

EASTBOURNE. W. W. S. MARCH.

DARKNESS NO DARKNESS. By Raymond Raynes, C.R. Faith Press 6s.

A parish priest whose people do not appear to be extensive readers of devotional books may wonder for whom some of them are published. Here is one with an attractive title written by a former Superior of the Community of the Resurrection. Its author does not

mean it to be used as a theological treatise, but as a help to those people who occasionally make a private retreat. Great stress is laid on humility and penitence and counsels are given in regard to them. But penitence must lead to obedience and "the vision of the perfection of charity, which we should long to emulate". For its achievement the right kind of prayer and a wise sacramentalism are taken for granted, and there is strong emphasis upon the joyful side of such a life of devotion, and upon the fact that spiritual desires themselves can become increasingly less self-regarding. "The only thing that really matters is to be a saint."

There are many fine sayings in the book, but we can discover no sign as to how Christian obedience is fitted into the complexities of life, when, for example, conscience is concerned with atomic warfare, the pressure of the mass mind in industry, or (say) disastrous experiences in married life.

West Bromwich. Frank W. Jones.

The Protestant Ministry. By Daniel Jenkins. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

In this book Mr Jenkins brings out of his treasure things new and old. The last three chapters, on "The Inner Life of the Minister", are reprinted from his *Gift of Ministry*, and are well worth it.

There is a refreshing air of originality in the new part of the book, which is headed "The Protestant Ministry To-day". Mr Jenkins never ploughs the old furrows.

In Chapter I, "The Ministry as the Ecumenical Problem", he lifts the ecumenical movement out of the sphere of denominational jigsaw puzzlers at conferences on to the practical parish level of ordinary Christian experience. This common life of Christians is seen as the primary ecumenical fact, since it is universal at a level deeper than denominational differences. The key to it is the ministry of word and sacraments, which brings people into this new common life, and keeps them there. The most valuable part of this essay deals with the modern divide between religion and life. "This is very much a part of the ecumenical problem because the ecumenical movement is concerned . . . with the wholeness of Christian obedience in all parts of life." "One of the hardest lessons the ministry may have to learn . . . is that large-scale visible unity will not be given to the churches until they all learn to pay . . . more attention to Christian obedience in the ordinary world."

The whole book has a salutary tendency to see the issues from the angle of the secular conditions which are inevitably their true setting—the unity of life and not just of churches, the ministry of the laity and not just of the clergy.

There is an interesting passage on the need for the Free Churches not so much to take episcopacy into their systems as more clearly to bring it out of their systems, where it is already inherent. He does not adequately appreciate the value to the ecumenical situation of

many honest episcopalians not really knowing what they mean by episcopacy, even while requiring it.

Of "The Minister's Place in Society" it is said, "A new puritanism is urgently needed in most churches, which cuts away ruthlessly from their life all organizations and activities which prevent their members from grappling with their real task".

He ends with a challenging sentence, ". . . it is essential that ministers should serve the revivifying Spirit by their own confident readiness to follow the Spirit into new paths".

SIMON PHIPPS.

THE KIRKBRIDE CONVERSATIONS. By Harry Blamires. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d

CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. By N. V. Banerjee. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

A CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY. By J. B. Coates. C. A. Watts and Co. 15s.

THE TRUTH OF RELIGION. By John B. Wilson. S.P.C.K. 4s.

The eponymous canon of Mr Blamires' outstanding new book, *The Kirkbride Conversations*, "knew that the philosophy of religion was one of the Devil's best weapons for keeping a man of intellect in a constant state of cerebral activity which could blind him to the personal religious challenge" (p. 139). It is the nice balance between this insight and the recognition that problems about Christian belief need nevertheless to be discussed that makes this account of conversations between the canon and an agnostic, intelligent young schoolmaster so good: it has some of the qualities of a Platonic Dialogue, with its blend of argumentation and circumstance, and some of the character of a novel, with its unfolding of the (by no means entirely intellectual) battle for the young man's soul. But though this is the best piece of Christian apologetic I have seen in a long while, it has an occasional weakness. For instance: "We don't have theological opinions—except perhaps over a small area of comparatively unimportant data. We have only theological knowledge—or ignorance. A man doesn't invent Christian theology. He learns it" (p. 51). Can all of this be maintained? True, a man does not invent theology: and it is absurd and presumptuous to sit down and excogitate a theory of salvation. But the educated agnostic is not now, as his forebears were, presented with but one live challenge, namely Christianity (albeit in varying forms). Quite a lot of people these days who are half or more outside religion are turning seriously to listen to non-Christian faiths. There are alternative bodies of alleged theological knowledge.

It is therefore interesting to read an Indian philosopher's comments on religion. Prof. N. V. Banerjee's *Concerning Human Understanding*, though mainly taken up with showing the philosophical thesis that "for our knowledge of the external world we are solely dependent upon enlightened common sense . . . deepened and refined by science" (p. 8), suggests that the basic value in religion must

lie in its recognition of the importance of selves and of their essentiality to one another. Here Prof. Banerjee reinterprets traditional Indian concepts: original Ignorance (*avidyā*) (not Sin) is blindness to one's essentiality to other selves; Buddhist *anattā* (the doctrine of no-self) has its application in self-effacement (i.e. entering into the lives of other selves) and a supreme example in the Cross; *nirvāṇa* becomes the spiritual regeneration involved in this. But the religion of God is here dropped; and Prof. Banerjee strenuously insists that religion must remain invisible, undistorted by outward rites, churches, priests or historical anchorage. In this last point he is expressing what is a strong *religious* sentiment among many Orientals. For even where religion comes down to earth in Hinduism and Buddhism, the proliferation of *avatars* and Buddhas helps to departicularize it. And Gandhi nearly became a Christian, but was unable to believe that there should have been only one Incarnation. This is a religious challenge, and Christian apologists (used to fighting a different sort of battle on the home front, though Buddhist missions may alter this) perhaps are not sufficiently alive to it and its brothers. Nevertheless, Prof. Banerjee's sanely written and dignified book does seem, despite the use of old religious concepts in new uniforms, to present little more than a version of humanism.

Another version is given by Mr Coates in his *A Challenge to Christianity*. He tries to see whether humanists really have anything in common save a denial of God and to set forth humanist views on morals, politics, education and culture. Most of his remarks on these things are sensible, though there is something paradoxical about his insistence that humanists must make their own choices about what is right and his attempt to give a systematic exposition of humanism: e.g. "Humanism will seek to found marriage on this principle of community . . ." (p. 191); "Humanism would safeguard the security of woman by safeguarding her economic independence" (p. 189); etc. Who says? And one or two of Mr Coates's practical suggestions are most questionable, even among non-Christians: e.g. "Women who desire it" (sc. abortion) "should be entitled to it by law" (p. 196). But, despite these things, this book deserves a serious hearing (the critique in it of modernist and modern theologians is especially lucid). Apologists will recognize that, save in some details, it cannot be replied to on the level of morality alone. Beyond that: we must turn to finding the truth.

Mr Wilson's *The Truth of Religion* is an attempt to describe the criteria of (though not the content of) religious truth: and this is a worthy philosophical aim. Not so worthy, though, the execution (perhaps because he addresses himself to sixth formers, *inter alios*; and this breeds over-simplicity and a schoolmasterish tone of print). Though his discussion of the concepts *faith* and *reason* is clear and his ultimate suggestion that the "metaphysical" assertions of religion are to be tested by reference to religious experience is probably correct, his treatment is too brief and sketchy. For (1) he sometimes speaks of "religion in general" as though religious assertions are homogeneous as between faiths; but *nirvāṇa* (which is not, by the

way, "heavenly bliss"; see p. 32) and *God*, for instance, have rather different epistemologies. (2) He classifies religious statements overcrudely—either historical ("Jesus lived in Nazareth"), scientific ("the earth is flat"), analytic ("a sacrament is an outward and visible sign . . .") or metaphysical ("God created the world"). This leaves him suggesting that Transubstantiation doctrine is about the supernatural world (but surely in a different sense from that in which statements about heaven are); and even that the Trinity doctrine is analytic (tells you how to use words like "person" and "substance" in Christianity). (3) He does not really attempt any phenomenology of religious experiences: without this his claims about tests or criteria are just pointers and promises. I do not think this sort of philosophy of religion can be done without a basis in the comparative study of religions.

One moral emerges: both philosophy and apologetics needs a wider purview. Benares is no longer far from the suburbs, or from Mr Blamires' northern town of Delphwick.

King's College, London. Ninian Smart.

Saint Augustine and his Influence through the Ages. By Henri Marrou. Longmans. 6s.

Le Stoicisme des Pères de l'Église. By Michel Spanneut. Editions du Seuil. N.p.

The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria. By Walter J. Burghardt. Catholic University of America Press. $3.

Henri Marrou is well known for his contribution to Patristic studies well beyond the confines of the Sorbonne. He has both delved deeply himself and also encouraged a number of students in their research. Michel Spanneut's book is the first in a series of detailed studies, which owe their inspiration to Prof. Marrou, who explains, in his foreword to Spanneut's book, that the aim of the series is not simply to provide the results of academic research. Truth must not be confined to the age when it was first apprehended, but its relevance in the present living cultural situation must also be recognized.

This principle is well followed out in the small volume on St Augustine, in which a whole mine of information is packed into less than 200 pages, from which scolar and unlearned alike can profit. Apart from a fascinating selection of St Augustine's writings, which cover not only his philosophy and theology, but also his prayer and devotional life, and an interesting analysis of his biblical quotations, Dr Marrou's notes refer to more than 120 varied passages in St Augustine's writings, whilst Prof. John J. O'Meara appends an exhaustive list of the works (together with a notice of those available in English translation) and a select 4-page bibliography which is not at all confined to Roman Catholic works. The book is described as being "lavishly illustrated"—but that is an understatement. If anything, there are too many—but this may seem ungrateful!

The key-thought is that "Augustinianism is first and essentially Christianity, and the whole of it". Although the author is largely concerned with the influence of St Augustine in the Roman tradition, he acknowledges the Augustinian elements in Reformation teaching: "Whether it is Luther or Calvin, they are all conscious of opposing what seems to them the practical Pelagianism taught by the Church of their time, and of recovering the genuine teaching of St Paul in the light of its severest interpretation by St Augustine." Jansenism is condemned for its "obsession" that St Augustine is "always right".

The book seeks to be largely popular, but, whilst an incentive to further study, is not quite a *first* introduction to the subject.

Spanneut is concerned to examine the thought-environment of the Patristic writers, and feels that the over-all influence of Stoicism in the first centuries of the Christian era, whether in its philosophical, cultural or popular pattern, has been inadequately considered. A brief notice can hardly do justice to what may well be a classic statement on the subject in a work which, despite the author's statement to the contrary, appears quite comprehensive. The influence of Stoicism in the spheres of morals and cosmology is especially noted, but its quest for basic unity or wholeness in life is the keynote of the book. The Fathers are concerned, too, to reject dualistic views of the universe and existence as a whole; their fundamental monism involves a "Unity of man! Unity of the world! Unity of man with the world! The same unity between the world and God, whose providence constitutes the law of the universe."

Fr Burghardt's volume likewise belongs to a series—one in studies in Christian Antiquity. It smacks somewhat of the doctorate thesis, but provides a careful study of what Cyril has to say on the doctrine of man. The statement that such a full-length study was "a felt need of theology" is perhaps going too far! Naturally, Cyril does not give a systematic treatment of the concept of the "Imago Dei" in man, and Dr Burghardt must strain out his material from the whole corpus of Cyril's writings. The writer feels it "imperative" that "Cyril's image (should not) lie in theological isolation", and despite the language which suggests the possibility of there being such a thing as "Cyril's theology of the image", is careful to bring Cyril's references to the image into relation with his over-all teaching of man's status before God and the effects of his redemption and restoration in Christ. Cyril rejects the distinction of Irenaeus between the "image" and the "likeness", but locates this image and likeness in man's soul, not in his body. Burghardt deals with six facets where the image is to be found—reason, freedom, dominion, sanctification, incorruptibility and sonship. Cyril is shown to vacillate between the view that the image is lost through sin and the view that it is but tarnished, but his treatment of the Incarnation leaves no doubt that there is full restoration in Christ—and even an enhancement of the original image.

Central Theological College,
Tokyo.

R. J. Hammer.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: W. E. Hocking, *The Coming World Civilization* (16s.); Soheil M. Afnan, *Avicenna* (30s.).

BURKE PUBLISHING CO.: H. E. Del Medico, *The Riddle of the Scrolls* (25s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. Victor Murray, *The State and the Church in a Free Society* (22s. 6d.); H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (52s. 6d.); Sir Thomas Browne, Edited by John Carter, *Urne Buriall and the Garden of Cyrus* (12s. 6d.).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*: Volume II, Part 2, *The Doctrine of God* (55s.).

CHRISTIAN STUDENTS' LIBRARY: W. B. Harris, *The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (Rs. 3.00).

EPWORTH PRESS: John T. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Arthur Samuel Peake*, 1865–1929 (21s.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): John Norton, trans. Douglas Horton, *The Answer* (38s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Herbert W. Abba, *To Build and to Plant* (7s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: C. H. Douglas Clark, *Christianity and Bertrand Russell* [a physicist's reply to *Why I am not a Christian*] (5s.).

MACMILLAN: Charles Caldwell Ryrie, *The Place of Women in the Church* (20s. 6d.); D. W. Gundry, *Religions* (16s.).

MARSHALL, MORGAN AND SCOTT: Archibald Hughes, *A New Heaven and a New Earth* [a study of the second coming] (17s. 6d.).

METHUEN: Michael Chinigo (Ed.), *The Teachings of Pope Pius XII* [an anthology of the Pope's pronouncements on a variety of subjects] (25s.).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION: Greville Norburn, *Five 'Isms of To-day: Modern Philosophers and Religious Belief* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Louis Bouyer, *The Cistercian Heritage* (22s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *The Ordinal—The Church of South India* (1s.); *An Order for Morning and Evening Prayer and a Service of Worship* [as recommended for use by the dioceses of Tirunelveli and S. Travancore in the C.S.I.] (1s.).

ST ANDREW PRESS: Stewart Mechie, *The Office of Lord High Commissioner* (10s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: M. E. Thrall, *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood* (8s. 6d.); Dorothée Hoch, *Healing and Salvation* (6s.); Nick Earle, *Stories for Children's Services* [for every Sunday in the year] (12s 6d); William Barclay, *More New Testament Words* [a 2nd series of articles from *The British Weekly*] (10s. 6d.); F. D. Maurice (Ed., A. R. Vidler), *The Kingdom of Christ*, Vols I and II (15s. each); David M. Paton (Ed.), *Church and Race in South Africa* (8s. 6d.).

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY (LLANSADWRN, MENAI BRIDGE, ANGLESEY): Book List, 1958 [annotated list of books recently published on O.T. subjects] (6s. post free).

S.P.C.K.: C. W. J. Bowles, *The Many Fundamentalisms* (1s.); *Spencer Leeson: Shepherd, Teacher, Friend* (15s. 6d.); Henry C. Stacy, *Lambeth Palace* [a photographic record with notes] (2s. 6d.); Bernard Mayes, *Getting it Across* [reprinted from THEOLOGY, June 1958] (1s.).

S.P.C.K. (FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): F. E. Brightman, *What Objections have been made to English Orders?* [Reprint; first published in 1896] (4s. 6d.); W. E. Collins, *Queen Elizabeth's Defence of her Proceedings in Church and State* [Reprint; first published in 1899] (5s. 6d); B. J. Kidd, *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice* [Reprint; first published in 1898] (9s. 6d.); Anon., *The Elizabethan Bishops and the Civil Power* [Reprint; first published in 1897] (3s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (9s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HISTORY

John McIntyre

The author gives us many helpful and illuminating insights . . . this is a valuable book and should be widely read. *Theology*

'In his scholarly work Dr. McIntyre has made a useful contribution to a subject of great urgency for the Church.' *The Christian World*

12s. 6d. net

THE ORIGIN AND TRANSMISSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

L. D. Twilley

'Gives a well-drawn picture of the early days of the Church in the light of the New Testament evidence and shows how the various canonical books came to be written . . . this book gives what may be deemed the essential minimum in ordered presentation and in clear language.' *Glasgow Herald*

8s. 6d. net

THE VISIBLE WORDS OF GOD

Joseph McLelland

'This book supplies a need which has long been felt . . . this is a work of manifast merit, a valuable contribution to Reformed theology as well as a thoughtful appreciation of the modern relevance of Peter Martyr's teaching. *Scotsman*

22s. 6d. net

From all Booksellers

OLIVER AND BOYD

Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh 1

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

G. F. S. Gray — **Paper, 7s. 6d.; Cloth, 12s. 6d.**

'An immense amount of information is contained in comparatively small compass.'
Times Literary Supplement

BISHOP AND PRESBYTERY

W. R. Foster — **25s. net**

'Shows among other things that a conspicuous part of the Church life from 1661 to 1688 was the continuity of the Presbyterian discipline in kirk-session and presbytery. There was a remarkable synthesis of Episcopal order and Calvinist doctrine and discipline. This is a book which every student of the period will welcome.'
Expository Times

WILLIAM THOMSON: ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
His Life and Times; 1819-90

H. Kirk-Smith — **35s. net**

Published for the Church Historical Society

Lovable the Archbishop may not have been; notable he must always be. His dramatic leadership won the support of men in the industrial North at a time when the Church and the industrial classes were out of step one with another. For this reason alone, Dr Kirk-Smith's book is timely and challenging.

THE TRUTH OF RELIGION

J. B. Wilson — **4s.**

'A highly competent piece of work which examines carefully the language of religion. Mr Wilson is always fair and ever ready to face possible objections that may be raised to any of his arguments.'
Baptist Times

S · P · C · K